DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 617 EA 004 [illegible]

AUTHOR Schmuck, Richard A.; Runkel, Philip J.
TITLE Integrating Organizational Specialists into School Districts.
PUB DATE Oct 71
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at National Training Laboratories Invitational Conference on New Technology in Organizational Development. (New York, N.Y., October 8-9, 1971)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Case Studies; *Change Agents; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educational Philosophy; *Group Dynamics; Organization; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Climate; *School Districts; Systems Analysis

ABSTRACT

In this paper, the authors describe (1) the role of the organizational specialist in trying to establish and maintain vertical and horizontal lines of communication in organizations; (2) two case studies of organizational development (Kent and Eugene); (3) the values of creativity, work, and sharing that guide the authors; (4) the general systems and group dynamics theories that provide a framework for organization self-renewal; (5) the use of the theory to establish a subsystem for organizational change; (6) a recommended sequence for integrating organizational specialists into school districts; and (7) helps and hindrances in establishing teams of organizational specialists, drawn from experience. (RA)

Integrating Organizational Specialists

into

School Districts

Richard . Schmuck and Philip J. Runkel

for

NTL Invitational Conference on New Technology in OD

New York City

October 8-9, 1971

Integrating Organizational Specialists into School Districts

Richard A. Schmuck and Philip J. Runkel*

No school district, no matter how well adapted to its current community, can remain adaptive by preserving a particular structure and process. As the community changes, the functions of the school must change, and schools presently are being urged to change in thoroughgoing, even radical ways. As we see it, organizational development for schools should strive primarily to develop an institutionalized capability for adaptive change. In fact, we think that training in organizational development should become a regularized activity within school districts. It is the rare educational organization that contains systematic methods for scrutinizing its own functioning and redirecting its efforts toward new, more adaptive goals and procedures.

It is one thing to state that training in organizational development should be built into every school district and something else to specify a practical means by which this can be brought about. Should every school district maintain a member of the OD network of NTL on a retainer fee? Should the district call in some firm of management consultants during periods of crisis or when things get too much out of

---

*Richard A. Schmuck is Professor of Educational Psychology and Philip J. Runkel is Professor of Psychology, both at the University of Oregon. Both are also members of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration where they have collaborated on research and development on OD for schools during the past four years.

kilter? Should school districts hire their own, permanent OD consultants? From these and other suggestions for ways of making organizational development available to school districts, we have chosen one referred to as the subsystem of organizational specialists, and we believe it holds great promise. In this paper, we describe the role of the organizational specialist, two actual groups of these specialists now at work, the values that guide us, some theory about the functioning of these specialists in OD and a few practical steps for establishing a team of organizational specialists that we have learned from our theory and from our field trials.

Role of the Organizational Specialist

The strategy we propose by which organizational development can become continuously available to a school district is that of establishing an agency for organizational training inside the district. But has not this scheme already been tried and found to have serious faults in many applications? Is it necessary [illegible] organi[illegible] consultants are looking for work? We believe our scheme is not one that has already been tried. We believe it is necessary because consultants from outside the district cannot provide the kind of continuous a ailability that school districts need. And we believe that establishing and maintaining teams of organizational specialists in school districts will provide plenty of work for professional OD consultants. Moreover, we believe our particular scheme endows the team of specialists with much of the advantage the outsider gains from not being entangled in the past

and future of the organization. At the same time, our scheme has the advantage of the insider who has already made entry, who has a constantly ready fund of diagnostic information, and who is on salary and on the job.

Key features of the team of specialists

We now describe features of the team of organizational specialists that can give it its special effectiveness for a school district.

Team and subsystem. The first essential feature of organizational specialists is that they are organized into a team and subsystem. They must have confidence in the abilities of one another, and they must trust one another to carry forward the goals of the group. This mutual confidence and trust should be sufficiently thorough that specialists can form subteams quickly when a request for consultation is received. The entire team must also become a subsystem of the district; that is, [illegible] viewed as a group carrying out legitimate and important activities. It must be identifiable as a group, have a supporting budget, and be known by others in the district to have a budget. In a district of about 600 staff, we have found that a subsystem of specialists can operate well if it is financially supported on an annual basis by one-half the coordinator's salary, one-tenth to one fifth of most other specialists' salaries, and a few thousand dollars per year for releasing occasional hours of the personnel with whom specialists are working.

Part-time assignment. The second important feature of the subsystem of specialists is their part-time assignment to the role. This

feature brings them the advantages of being both insider and outsider. The fact that the specialist, during most of the week, is a teacher, counselor, principal or assistant superintendent like anybody else means that he is already "one of the boys." Unlike the outside stranger, there is little need to worry that the specialist may use the district for his own purposes and never be seen again. The part-time specialist, too, will not be likely to carry out his duties as organizational specialist at the expense of teachers or principals, because he is himself a teacher or principal. And while the part-time specialist gains these advantages of the insider, he can also acquire a vital advantage of the outsider. He can enjoy detached status because of the fact that most districts are large enough that a member of one school is in fact an outsider to a member of another school. We find that [illegible] f one school will accord trust and confidence to an organizational specialist employed as a teacher in another school in much the same way that they will give trust and confidence to a consultant on fee.

The part-time assignment of specialists gives the whole scheme certain advantages beyond those of the insider and outsider. One is the fact that each specialist becomes a channel of communication between his own segment of the district and the team of specialists as a whole. Another is that each specialist becomes a source of support and expertness when others of his specialist-colleagues are working with the segment of the district of which he is a regular part.

Own renewal. The third feature is that of self-renewal within the specialists' subsystem itself. The specialist should establish

training and selection procedures by which to replenish their own ranks. They should employ procedures to maintain strength in their own group dynamics. And they should maintain liaison with outside agencies and consultants from whom they can learn more about organizational development and upon whom they can call for special help.

Readiness. The fourth feature is that organizational specialists do not administer, direct, supervise, or install. They wait for the school or department to demonstrate readiness to make use of aid before they offer their wares. Even when called on, the specialists sometimes make doubly sure of the client's readiness by working out tentative stages of mutual commitment to the project.

Process, not content. Finally, organizational specialists should not give advice about the content problems. They do not pose as experts in curriculum, finance, teaching methods, or whatever. Instead, they offer a greater range of group and organizational processes than school people ordinarily use as helps to members of the district in working on their own important problems. The specialist offers methods, of working toward answers; he does not offer the answers themselves. As long as the specialist restricts himself to offering process and method, his client need never feel that his own expertness is being taken out of his hands.

Activities of the specialists

It is through work with the organizational and interpersonal processes in school and district that the specialists become most visible.

The specialists train others in communication skills, innovative group processes, and problem-solving procedures. They provide a source of fresh ideas on new ways of working together and serve as a channel through which other people's innovative ideas about organizational procedures--both from within and without the district--can be brought to points where they can be converted into reality. Seven kinds of activity that frequently recur in the work of the specialists are listed below. Along with each, we mention some skills the specialists seek to transmit and some sorts of actions through which school people sometimes make use of their new skills.

1. Organizational specialists try to develop clear communication up, down, and laterally. Toward this end, they teach communicative skills such as paraphrasing and perception checking. It sometimes happens, as a result, that a school faculty asks for a workshop in which all its members can improve the communicative methods they use with one another.

2. Specialists seek to increase the understanding people have of the ways different parts of the district affect one another. A useful skill is that of using systematic information-gathering techniques such as questionnaires, interviews, and direct observations. Members of the district often arrange sessions at which the information is given back to school faculties, central-office departments, parent groups, and others.

3. Specialists help spread skills in writing educational objectives and specifying operational definitions as an aid to understanding the educational goals held by persons in various parts of the district.

Toward this same end, groups from different parts of a district sometimes meet to compare the observable and behavior outcomes toward which they are striving.

4. Specialists try to improve the skill of groups in systematic problem solving. Many different kinds of groups can invite specialists to help them make their problem solving and decision making more systematic and susceptible to monitoring; examples are teaching teams, departmental bodies, meetings of department heads, and committees of all sorts.

5. Specialists encourage schools and districts to develop new ways of assessing progress toward educational goals. They often refer school people to experts in collecting evaluative data, in systems analysis, and in other technical aids.

6. Specialists try to bring into use the relevant knowledge, skill, and energy of all persons involved in a task. Toward this end, they teach communicative skills that can increase participation in small group discussion. They offer consultation on effective procedures for running meetings. They also arrange confrontations between groups to reduce misapprehensions and increase the amount of correct and realistic information each group has about the other with which it must work. Groups in schools and districts can profit from diagnosing the influence processes in which they are embedded, comparing their diagnoses with diagnoses made by other groups, and developing plans for opening new paths for influence.

7. Specialists are always alert for innovative practices that

can serve the goals of school and district. To locate structures and processes where innovation is needed, specialists watch for expressions of frustration and for creative practices even when they cause anxiety. Specialists teach others, too, to help make both frustration and creativity more visible to all. One frequent technique is to bring together the people with frustrations and those with creative ideas, in preparation for later problem-solving activity.

The Kent Project

Now that we have described the chief features of a team of organizational specialists and their typical activities, we shall describe briefly two projects in which teams of specialists have been established in school districts. The first is referred to as the Kent Project.

As part of a 2½ year intervention, we as consultants from the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA), established a team of organizational specialists in the school district at Kent, Washington. As consultants from outside, we launched the organizational development project but later turned over the task of continued training to organizational specialists within the Kent district.

Our first contact with Kent came through a counselor who had obtained approval to visit us from members of the superintendent's cabinet. Early contact with the superintendent's office was cautious on both sides, since the district had recently spent a large sum of money for a management-consultant firm to study and recommend a reorganization

of the district's organizational structure. This reorganization had been mostly accomplished, but among the consequences were a high degree of suspicion on the part of many teachers and a good deal of misunderstanding by all of the new structure.

The superintendent and his cabinet granted initial approval to the project during a meeting in September, 1967, and a steering committee was formed, containing representatives from all levels of the district's professional staff and one from the public sector. This committee was liaison between CASEA and the Kent district and was intended to have advisory reponsibilities for the OD project.

In all, the period of entering the district lasted seven months. During this period we met with the building principals and representatives to the local educational association. We tried to gain approval from every level of the professional hierarchy so that the project would be "owned" by the entire district and not simply by the management. Because each building was being represented by a principal and at least one representative to the education association's board, and because we had sought approval at meetings of principals and of the education association's board, we hoped that each building staff would also be agreeable to the project. As it turned out, this often was not the case, and the process of entering negotiating, and committing subsystems to engage in OD training had to be repeated through the tenure of the project.

We carried out training events in several important parts of the district during the year before the team of specialists was started. Although most of the personnel of the district were aware of the training

at least vaguely, 30 percent or perhaps more were never directly involved because of limited time and resources of the CASEA staff. These training events were designed to increase the communication and group problem-solving skills of teams of personnel filling influential line and staff positions in the district, both in schools and in the central office. Our plan was to demonstrate the benefits of OD training to personnel in a variety of such key positions. A skeletal summary of these events is presented here; details can be found in Langmeyer, Schmuck, and Runkel (1971).

Stage 1: Training for Personnel with Line Functions.

In April, 1968, we invited certain personnel performing line functions in the district to the first training event. Trainees included the superintendent and his cabinet, the elementary and secondary principals, and teachers who were leaders within the Kent Education Association. At least one teacher from every building attended the meeting, along with the officers of the association.

The event lasted four days, but only the superintendent's cabinet was present all of the time. On the first day, before others arrived, the superintendent and his cabinet discussed ways in which communication was breaking down among them, the lack of clarity in their role definitions, the ambiguous norms that existed in the cabinet, and, finally, their strengths as a group.

On the second day, the principals joined the cabinet in a specially designed intergroup confrontation that brought into the open

organizational problems seen by each group as involving the other. Next, on the evening of that same day, teachers arrived to join the principals and cabinet, and for four hours these influential line personnel generated a list of organizational problems in the Kent district. The principals went back to their buildings the next day, leaving time for teachers and cabinet to interact in a modified intergroup confrontation. On the fourth and final day, the cabinet met alone to summarize the week and to schedule dates for their own problem solving.

This initial training event served partly the purpose of direct training and partly the function of a demonstration in OD. Most of the participants were convinced of the usefulness of laboratory training for organizational development, and many of them helped to bring us friendly receptions later in their own parts of the districts.

Stage 2: Training for Principals in Human Relations.

All principals were strongly urged to participate in a basic human relation laboratory that was offered in June of 1968 by the National Training Laboratories of the Northwest, and all did. In general, the training brought about increased skill in interpersonal relations and increased awareness of the effects of one's own responses on others (see Thomas, 1970). We have no evidence, however, that this training facilitated our own work of organizational development in the district. On the contrary, we believe it hindered our work to some degree by leading the principals to believe that OD training and the work of the organizational specialists would be similar to the T-group experiences

they had had.

Stage 3: Training for Personnel with Staff Functions.

Personnel in staff roles in the divisions of Student Personnel Services and Curriculum Development attended a three-day conference in September 1968; they were joined for one-half day by the principals. Just as when the line personnel received training, these groups participated in a period of intergroup confrontation that unearthed a number of problems for systematic work. Each group began to work through a sequence of problem solving and made concrete plans to continue these efforts "back home." This event left the participants with mixed feelings.

Stage 4: Training for the Business Department.

In November, 1968, the business personnel who had not yet been involved in the training were given two days of training in communication skills, group exercises, and problem solving. The training was similar in spirit and design to the events with the line and staff personnel, except that no confrontations with other role groups took place. The results seemed helpful but not remarkable.

Stage 5: Training for Selected School Staffs.

From September 1968 to April 1969, we worked with five school staffs. These training sessions were aimed at introducing a large

number of teachers to the benefits of OD and at reaching subsystems within the district other than the administrative personnel. The chief effect of these training events was to increase the awareness of a number of personnel of the meaning and procedures of OD. Certain of these schools later requested more work in OD from the organizational specialists; others did not. Perhaps the most significant result of these interventions was that many of the volunteers to be trained as future specialists came from the buildings in which some training took place.

Recruiting the Kent specialists

In the spring of 1969, information was circulated throughout the district that a workshop would be held in June 1969 for Kent personnel who wished to become organizational specialists. The mimeographed circular stated that the specialist would become knowledgeable and skillful in group processes. He would serve on committees to give feedback or as a trainer for special groups within the district. We hoped that personnel from all hierarchical levels would volunteer to become organizational specialists.

The first steps in establishing the role of organizational specialist in the district had already been taken when the school board approved the original contract, but it was imperative that the role be supported with released time, a part-time coordinator, and the official blessings of the district. There were several tense moments when the teachers were negotiating for a new contract and early reports seemed to indicate that adequate money might not be available -- but commitments to the project were high and the matter was resolved with ten days allotted to each specialist for OD

work during the school year. Further, a part-time coordinator was appointed.

Applications were solicited from all professional members of the school district. Twenty-three district personnel were selected from those who applied. They represented a very wide cross section of the district: teachers, counselors, principals from elementary and secondary schools, curriculum and student personnel specialists, and assistant superintendents.

Training the Kent specialists

The Kent specialists began their training with a two-week workshop during June, 1969. The goals of the first week's sessions were to introduce them to many of the techniques, exercises, procedures, and skills that we had found useful in OD; to provide each of them with an opportunity to explore the impact of his behavior on a group; to establish them as a cohesive, vital, functioning unit; and to give them practice in leading some training activities. The participants spent the first three days in small groups going through many exercises and activities, with participants rotating in the role of co-trainer for these activities. In the last two days of the first week, the participants were asked to design activities for themselves that would help strengthen their team -- activities focused either on the group or on participants' skills.

For the second week of the workshop, the twenty-three specialists divided themselves into six teams, each containing at least one CASEA trainer. The total group of specialists established potential target groups within the school district and each team selected one potential target with which to work. Among the target activities were workshops

for several schools to be held prior to the opening of school or during the year, a continuation of work started with the cadet at a senior high school, work articulating relations between principals and counselors, and work with a community advisory group. The rest of the week was spent establishing goals for training with the targets, gathering diagnostic data about the targets, analyzing the data to establish forces operating in the target groups, and designing the training events. We worked closely with these subgroups, anticipating the follow-up help we would give to the specialists during the academic year.

We worked with the Kent specialists during the first two-thirds of the 1969-70 academic year, withdrawing in March 1970. Thus, the training events that were engineered by the Kent specialists were observed and criticized by the outside consultants. This collaboration was part of a deliberate plan to support the development of training skills within the specialist team. Approximately ten different training events occurred with our assistance. Most of these events were successful in raising interest in the district in improving communication, group processes, and organizational problem-solving.

Coordinator of the Kent specialists

A key role in helping the specialists to function effectively was carried out by the coordinator. Many of his duties were very similar to those of curriculum coordinators; he handled budget arrangements, secured relevant training materials in his office, kept careful records of the project, served as convener of the specialists' steering committee, and worked closely with colleges in the State of Washington to arrange for training courses to receive college credit.

Other of his duties were unique in the district. Because the organizational specialists cut across all important jobs in the district and because they served the entire system, the coordinator reported directly to the superintendent. All projects were discussed with the superintendent before they were launched. Unlike persons in line positions, however, neither the coordinator nor any of the other organizational specialists directed any work of people in the schools. And unlike persons in staff positions, their advisory and facilitative functions were not restricted to administrators. Everyone in the district had direct access to the organizational specialists; no one was required to have the approval of a superior before opening conversations with them.

The coordinator served as an active link between the specialists and the rest of the district. When the coordinator received a request for specialists' services, he and the person or group requesting the service typically listed the particular specialists who would be mutually acceptable. Only those listed would then be asked about their availability. In relaying requests to the specialists, the coordinator ordered the requests so as to rotate the work fairly evenly; the object was to avoid developing an elite corps who might become the only ones to take on difficult training tasks. As the project gained prestige and was recognized by other school districts as vaulable, the coordinator processed all out-of-district requests for services. The coordinator was helped in his work by a steering committee formed within the body of 23 specialists. Membership in this committee rotates from month to month.

Work of the Kent specialists

During the first year of operation, the organizational specialists

focused primarily on four target groups: an elementary school staff moving toward a multiunit structure, the superintendent and his cabinet, teachers interested in improving their communication skills, and a junior high staff. Limited work was carried out with a group of parents and with a senior high school. Of the four primary interventions, three appeared to be successfully executed.

The most successful training was carried out at the elementary school that was moving toward a multiunit organization. Several factors in this school were conducive to OD training. The school had few walls; the newness and freedom of the physical plant encouraged the staff to be creative about teaching strategies. The principal had been trained as an organizational specialist; he felt secure with the training process and encouraged the more retiring staff members to become involved. Another indicator of potential success was that some of the teachers aided the principal in selecting the particular specialists who were to work with the staff.

The first training with this school took place in August 1969 just before school began; it lasted for two days. The first day was spent in group exercises and in practicing communication skills. On the second day, the staff participated in group problem solving, making plans to short-circuit organizational problems that might arise during the academic year. The specialists met again with the faculty for three half-day sessions during September, October, and November. (These sessions were easily arranged because the staff was double shifting until Christmas.)

Assessment of the training indicated that the teachers thought that the specialists had developed a well-organized training design, that the teachers were experiencing clear communication with the principal, and

that they were working smoothly and effectively in their teams. Several teachers commented that they were gratified to see the specialists using the skills they were teaching.

A second successful intervention occurred when another team of specialists worked with the superintendent and his staff during cabinet meetings. Before any help from specialists was given, the superintendent and his staff generally agreed that communication at their cabinet meetings was poor. Participants seemed uncertain of their roles and hesitated to disagree at staff meetings with the superintendent even when debate might improve the group's decision making. Few decisions were made at the meetings; instead, cabinet members thought that decisions were being made on the outside in unknown ways. Other staff members in the district distrusted the lack of openness they perceived on the part of the cabinet. Much confusion and distrust persisted in the district.

In February 1970, the superintendent decided to open the cabinet meetings to broader participation. The group was re-named "staff" and the principals and teachers were invited to send representatives. In this new form, the meetings were open to participation by representatives of several district groups, the superintendent participated more as a group member and less as a laissez-faire leader, procedures were agreed upon by the total group, and time was devoted to discussing group processes at the meeting. In March, the superintendent and his staff agreed that one or two organizational specialists should attend staff meetings to serve as official observers of the communication processes.

As a result of feedback from the specialists at twelve weekly meetings, the following changes in group processes occurred:

1. The superintendent periodically stepped out of the role of

"presenter." Presentations were made by a variety of participants.

2. The superintendent often relinquished the role of convener (chairman or moderator) to participate more freely in the discussions.

3. Agreements were made by the group on procedures to help the meetings run smoothly. The superintendent (who had been expected to prescribe such procedural rules) acted merely as another member while these agreements were being reached.

4. Time at the end of the meeting was used to discuss (debrief) the group processes that occurred during that meeting. The specialists gave feedback during this time on their observations.

As a result of these changes, less adverse criticism of the meetings was made by participants and less distrust seemed to be manifested by others in the district toward the superintendent.

A third successful intervention was a two-course sequence prepared for interested teachers in the district. In the first course, entitled "Techniques in Communication," the communication skills of paraphrasing, describing behavior, describing own feelings, and checking one's perception of others' feelings were taught. Also, the participants experienced several group exercises and learned how to carry out an organizational problem-solving sequence. The second course, entitled "Communications and Interpersonal Relations," was an advanced training experience in which the communication skills, exercises, and procedures were reviewed and related to group processes in the classroom. Those who successfully completed both courses and who were enthusiastic about them became candidates for posts on the team of organizational specialists.

Although no intervention created a great deal of strain or adverse criticism, one can fairly be called unsuccessful. The unproductive

experience took place in a training event designed for a junior high school. One of the organizational specialists had reported that some staff members in one of the junior high schools were seen by other faculty as failing to take their share of responsibility for encouraging students to behave properly in the halls. The resulting tensions -- so the specialist understood -- had created several warring subgroups on the faculty; consequently, the faculty as a whole communicated and worked together very poorly. A team of specialists was assigned to the building and their conversations with the principal started during July, 1969.

In November, the specialists were taken aback to hear the teachers in the building state that the problem no longer existed. They discovered that during the summer the principal had taken steps to correct the lack of clarity about discipline in a way acceptable to most teachers. But the specialists did not learn of these steps until they had carried out several training sessions at the school. The specialists had intended the training to culminate in a problem-solving process to work on clarifying staff norms about disciplining students. The school staff was surprised that the consultants raised discipline as a problem soon after they had worked on it. The specialists were unsure about how to respond, imagining that some of the teachers were unrealistically defending the existing conditions of the school. The resulting confusions were followed by antogonistic remarks toward the specialists and a demand that they stop the training until further notice.

By March, 1970, we were giving no aid to the Kent specialists in selecting tasks, designing training, or carrying out the training. The

specialists made the transition very smoothly. By the end of the summer of 1970 they had conducted OD training ranging from a half a day to a full week with seven elementary schools, the superintendent and his immediate staff, the program specialists within the Curriculum Division, a group of principals, some groups of parents, and a group of 80 students in a "multi-ethnic camp." Moreover, they had laid plans for the 1970-71 school year that included some continued or advanced work and some new work. For details of this second year of training see Wyant (1971).

The Eugene Project

After the Kent experience, we decided to test whether an effective team of specialists could be integrated into a district without a prior period of district-wide OD training. With what we had learned in Kent about selection, training, and follow-up support of the specialists, we had a strong foundation for another try at creating a specialist-team. Moreover, we were growing toward a point of some maturity with our theory and technology of OD for schools (see Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, and Derr in preparation).

The Eugene district offered an ideal setting for such an attempt. No district-wide OD had taken place; this meant that the district as a whole did not become accustomed to CASEA trainers before encountering their own organizational specialists. It also meant that the superintendent and his assistants were not given training before the organizational specialists. On the other side, many personnel were knowledgeable about our work, and many had also experienced demonstrations or college courses on communication skills and group problem solving. We already had been

active in a part of the district, experimenting with OD in establishing the multiunit structure in four elementary schools. Discussions with Eugene personnel about creating a team of organizational specialists commenced in the fall of 1970.

Recruiting the Eugene specialists

Certain ideas and desires were paramount in our thinking because of the Kent project. First, we wanted a strong coordinator, highly respected by district personnel for his expertise, efficiency, and tactful interpersonal relations. We also wanted him to be knowledgeable, comfortable, and excited about OD training. We found our man in one of the coordinators of the multiunit project. Second, we wanted to reach clear agreements with the chief administrators in the central office about the nature of the project. We accomplished this through several meetings during the winter of 1970-71, and by recruiting three of the four Area Directors (who serve substantially as deputies to the superintendent) to the specialist training program. Third, we wanted to publicize the project accurately, clearly, and widely; we also wanted the procedures for applying to conform to district policy and tradition. Fourth, we wanted to receive many more applications than could be accepted and we wanted to receive them from all professional jobs in the district. We did receive 75 applications and we could accept only 25 of them for training. As we had hoped, the trainees represented all professional jobs, including area directors, curriculum coordinators, counselors, principals, and teachers. Fifth, we decided to add a week to the summer training, making three weeks in all. Our period of co-training with the specialists during the school

year was scheduled to run from August, 1971 to April, 1972. All totaled, we hoped to cut the time spent in Eugene to about one half the time we spent in Kent.

Training the Eugene specialists

The Eugene specialists started their preparation with two weeks of training in June, 1971. A third week of training took place in August, 1971, just prior to the start of the school year. Goals of the first week's sessions were similar to those pursued in Kent. The activities included practicing warm-up exercises, communication skills, and group and intergroup exercises and procedures. Heavier emphasis was placed on intergroup exercises and data feedback techniques than had been given in Kent. During the activities, trainees discussed their perceptions and feelings about the district, the resources they brought to the specialist team, their feelings about membership on the team, and their views of the goals of the team. We asked them to read theoretical expositions of such topics as clarifying communication, establishing goals, uncovering conflicts, and making decisions, and to discuss the topics amongst themselves.

During the second week, we focused largely on the stages of an OD intervention. We reviewed what we had learned in Kent about each stage and asked the trainees to carry out simulations of each stage. The stages were: entry and contract-building, diagnosing, designing, implementing major training events, assessing, and follow-up training. We placed special emphasis on entry and diagnosis, because these represented problems for the Kent specialists. Also, we offered a great deal of conceptual input with our Handbook (Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, and Derr, in

preparation).

Toward the end of the week the trainees established some agreements on how they would work as a team and developed a temporary plan to establish at least four different sorts of subteams within the specialist group during the fall of 1971. Our Kent experience helped us guide them in designating the teams. They were (1) a demonstration team to plan and carry out short meetings in the district to inform personnel about the goals, skills, and actions of the specialists, (2) an inservice course team to plan and carry out short courses for interested personnel on such topics as communication skills, problem solving, applications of OD to the classroom, etc., (3) a team to do OD training with schools and subsystems that had already received some previous training, e.g., the multiunit schools, and (4) a team to do OD training with subsystems that had not yet received training.

Between the June and August training, the coordinator made plans with several schools -- some of which had undergone previous OD and some of which had not -- to receive training in the fall from subteams of specialists. It was necessary that he make the arrangements by himself, because many of the specialists were on vacation and the target schools needed to make plans to receive the specialists. Also during this interim, the coordinator, along with a few specialists, laid plans for a slide-presentation to be used by the demonstration team.

During the one week of training in August, the specialists divided into subteams to plan for demonstrations, inservice courses and OD events. CASEA consultants joined each subteam as co-trainers. Each subteam tried out some of its plans on the other specialists to receive feedback before executing the plan in the real world of the district. At

the time of this writing, the subteams are just getting into their work within the district.

Values

We wish now to pause in our discussion of the organizational specialists to state some of the values that guide us in these projects. Each of these projects has contained episodes that were sheer joy, when almost everyone seemed barely to be touching the ground. Some of the achievements of school faculties seem to us works of art -- a sort of improvisation on a theme while modulating from one organizational key to another, with every member of the combo coming in on his own cue, without rehearsal. Yet, when we are asked to explain the value of these celebrations of human interaction, we often find ourselves saying that they lead to other things that are good -- like more hours devoted to work instead of spells of suspicious anxiety, the use of more resources in building a more effective curriculum, or a more satisfying life for students. And then we are likely to ask ourselves why those things are good. A short-hand way of describing our most basic value position is to say that we value the delight of joining and working with others to strive toward creating new, more adaptable human processes.

Striving to create

Building a new phenomenon is deeply gratifying to us. It is a joy to produce a set of events that did not exist before, quite aside from what it does or what it leads to. Joining with others in the joy of this creativity is even better. It is a good thing, not needing any other

justification, to stand with fellow workers and gaze upon our handiwork. Comfort and pleasantness are not to be bought at all costs; creating events is sometimes hard and painful.

Joining with others

When there is disagreement about what to build or how to build it, one way to eliminate disagreement is to get rid of the people who disagree with oneself. This is like the conqueror who believes that he can win only if others lose. This is not the kind of achievement or creativity we value. We value the condition of joining with others to overcome obstacles. We enjoy, needing no justification for it, fitting our own well-articulated contribution into the contributions of the rest of the team. It is even better when it is very clear that everyone else is feeling the same kind of gratification.

Delighting in work

Work, we believe, is as human as play. Quite aside from what else work achieves -- such as a knowledge of arithmetic, a plan for a basketball tournament, or the commitment of an employer to provide work experience for high school students -- work can also achieve the satisfaction of individual human needs. While we grant that work must some times get done for the welfare of the group or society even though it is painful or even damaging to some of the individuals involved, we nevertheless value most the kind of work and the kind of organization that enable the most individuals to find most of their duties personally rewarding. In brief, work can be beautiful for many people much of the time, and that's the

way we prefer it.

Implications

Valuing the conditions we have just described, we also value behavior in organizations that will lead to the valued conditions. Since we value striving to create, we want organizations to state goals explicitly and pursue them flexibly and vigorously. We find that humans are very adaptable; almost everyone can contribute a valuable part to a goal that most others in a group want to pursue and almost everyone can find gratification in doing so. But people are not infinitely adaptable; in a group of twenty or thirty, there is often one who is over-stressed by the changes OD brings. Sometimes the group cannot help this person to adapt without taking an exhorbitant amount of time from the organization's tasks. In such a case, the best course of action is to seek a place for the unconverted person in some other school or district. Always, the morphogenesis of the organization is a resolution of some sort of conflicts among individual needs and environmental demands.

Valuing striving toward explicit goals means that conflict and pain in the organization must be made known and treated as materials among other materials from which achievement is built. When an individual suffers for the sake of the group goal and he hides his suffering, others can remain unaware of his sacrifice and he himself can come to feel that others are profiting unduly at his expense. If his suffering is openly admitted, others can be grateful for the gift he has made to the group goal and can reward him with their appreciation. At later stages of the work, any necessary sacrifices can be equitably redistributed.

Since we value joining with others, we must seek to draw out the abilities, knowledge, and other resources of every individual so that all can be welcomed and valued. If one person contributes a disproportionately large share of resources, he can come to be valued because he can be exploited; others will come to feel that they cannot repay the one person's contributions, and they will develop rationales for accepting more than they give. The person with the extra resources will find himself "buying" pleasant relations between himself and others. I can freely join a group and be accepted only to the extent that all the others can freely join and be accepted. And this can occur only if everyone has something valuable to offer the group. In our experience, almost everyone does have something valuable to offer almost every group.

Similarly, we value ways of solving problems that maximize the gains of the maximum number of people and minimize the losses of a maximum number. And to do this, an organization must anticipate changes in the environment and initiate alterations before the demands from the environment produce strong stresses and polarize the members of the organization about responsive policy. If almost everyone is continuously or recurrently involved in adaptive problem-solving, then each person can be committed, at almost every moment, to action that moves him toward his own goals while at the same time moving the organization toward its goals. As long as this condition can continue, people will not need to choose up sides and try to win at the expense of the other side.

Just as valuing striving means that people must become aware of pain in the working group, whether their own pain or that of others, so valuing joining means that people must become aware of joy in the group, whether their own or others'. I cannot take joy in sharing the work of the group unless the others recognize the possibility, recognize my own

state through their own empathy, and hold the moment for me while I express my gladness.

Since we value delighting in one's work, it is necessary that we know whether others are finding pleasure in their work. We cannot all enjoy every moment of our work. Sometimes one or another of us must undergo drudgery or even pain for the larger job to get done. If one person is not to get more than his share of unpleasantness, it is necessary for the pleasure and pain each person is finding in his work to be widely known in the group. Only by bringing feelings about the job into the open can an equitable sharing of pleasure and pain be assured.

Theory

We draw strongly on two bodies of theory to guide our attempts at integrating organizational specialists into school districts. One is that of general systems theory, with its concept of the self-renewing or morphogenetic organization, making continuous, adaptive changes by maintaining a lively variety pool of resources and delicately monitoring its success in coping with its environment. For example, since one current tension revolves around intergenerational conflict, the self-renewing school of today will find ways to involve students in more decisions about the school's operation and what is to be taught in the classrooms. A self-renewing district maintains openness to its environment, responsiveness among its internal subsystems, and an open flow of its members' competencies so as to use its own resources as a district to cope with environmental changes.

Self-renewing organizations -- whether they are teaching teams, schools, or entire districts -- are adaptive in the long run; hence, they

are not set in any single organizational structure or procedure. While there is typically some formal hierarchy, form follows function. People are organized into groups to solve specific problems; both the structure of the organization and the methods used in the groups change to suit the nature of the current problems.

In self-renewing organizations, decisions are made by the persons who have the information. Instead of looking to those who have the legitimate authority, emphasis is placed on the best possible decision. Decision-making requires adequate information; all too often, those in authority lack information or have it in a distorted form. In a self-renewing school, for example, a group of students and parents may decide on dress codes; teachers and students may decide on classroom procedures; teachers, principal, and superintendent may decide on whether to institute in-service leadership training for the principals.

A self-renewing organization has sensing processes and feedback mechanisms to tell when changes are needed. There is open communication within the school district and between the district and the community on the question of when the school needs to change. A self-renewing organization manages itself according to specified goals accepted by its members. It has systematic methods (e.g., problem-solving techniques) for dealing with obstacles to reaching these goals. The goals, naturally, are open to change as the environment of the district changes.

A self-renewing organization has a culture which permits the processes mentioned above to take place. There is open, direct, and clear communication. Conflict is viewed as inevitable and natural and is brought out into the open so that it can be used to bring about creative change instead of impeding the work to be accomplished. Creativity,

even wild dreaming, are encouraged. New ideas and new persons and groups are seen as additional resources rather than as troublemakers and threats.

We view integrating a team of organizational specialists into a school district as a long step in endowing a district with the self-renewing capacity. In pursuit of the self-renewing school district, the job of organizational specialists is to increase the effectiveness of groups as task-oriented entities and to lead school personnel to function more effectively as components of working bodies carrying out their specific tasks. The key to a job well done lies in a school's capacity to solve its own problems by using the resources already present. These resources include information about different curricula, willingness to take risks, and creativity in teaching. Staff resources are not simply ideas residing in a filing cabinet. Rather, resources are truly available only when a work group calls upon members for fresh ways of doing things, when each member feels unafraid in offering his own ideas for use, and when the norms of the group enable a new idea to be moved into action with reasonable speed and commitment. It is the specialist's commitment to enhance these capabilities.

Work of the organizational specialist differs significantly from the sort of help offered by a traditional management consultant. Traditional consultants work on problems as they are defined by the administrators of the organization. After interviews and observations are made, reports are issued that recommend solutions to the original problems. Rarely does a traditional consultant stay with an organization long enough to help it carry the recommendations into practice. Organizational specialists, on the other hand, explore problems from the perspectives of all parts of the organization and include relevant parties within and without

the organization in designing and implementing change. Frequent training sessions help the school personnel to carry out the changes they themselves designed.

The work of the organizational specialist also differs significantly from that of the sensitivity trainer. Although the specialist makes use of the organization as its own laboratory for experiential or inductive learning techniques, he uses these "laboratory groups" in very different ways from sensitivity or T-groups. The targets of the OD training are the membership as a whole and as subgroups. The specialist seeks to help modify norms and the definition of roles. He does not seek to change personalities, nor is the OD training aimed at facilitating personal growth.

The other chief body of theory upon which we draw is the branch of group dynamics that studies the helps and hindrances that individuals bring to the group task. The writings of McGregor (1967) sum up our position on these matters very well. See also Katz and Kahn (1966) and Schein and Bennis (1955) as other representative examples.

Schools are complex organizations stabilized by role expectations and interpersonal norms. Faculty members behave predictably largely because they adhere to shared expectations for what is appropriate in the school. Norms are compelling stabilizers because individuals monitor one another's behavior. It is the strength of this shared feeling that makes a school organization so resistant to modification but at the same time offers the specialist a leverage point for planned change. Norms provide the school organization with its structure and coherence. Members of a staff behave in patterned and predictable ways because their behaviors are guided by common expectations, attitudes, and understandings. Norms are especially serviceable and tenacious when individual staff members

specialists. On the other side, many personnel were knowledgeable about our work, and many had also experienced demonstrations or college courses on communication skills and group problem solving. We already had been

intrinsically value the normative behavior in the school or when they perceive such behavior as instrumental in reaching other valued goals. In any case, norms are strong stabilizers of organizational behavior.

Norms about relations between individuals produce role prescriptions. Role-taking is done as part of an interaction with other role-takers. If it is said that an organizational member is performing poorly in a given job, it means that the interaction between the job-holder and his role reciprocators is breaking down. In this sense, the point of a specialist's intervention for improving a subsystem is not a person but rather the interaction patterns linking role reciprocators.

A specialist's intervention must bring a subsystem new ways of carrying out interpersonal interaction; further, these new procedures should be entered into by the actual role reciprocators who make the subsystem run. Changes in organizational norms and roles are most efficiently brought into being and made stable by asking staff members to behave in new ways in their actual work-group setting while, at the same time, other role-takers observe these new behaviors. Norms will not be altered unless other relevant role-takers are allowed to see that their colleagues actually accept the new patterns of behavior in the setting of the school.

Many subsystems in school districts call for staff members to interact daily in mutual interdependence and reciprocity. These subsystems, especially when they are face-to-face and intimate, require more detailed norms than does the district at large. The norms of such subsystems center on methods for work, interpersonal values, and social-emotional customs. Each face-to-face work group rewards certain manners of speech, behaviors, gestures, etc., and not others; it also approves certain topics for discussion and not others.

In these groups, individual differences in personality become important, sometimes crucially so. Especially important are emotional predispositions and interpersonal competencies or skills. Alteration of some interpersonal patterns can be brought about by administrative directive, but patterns of interpersonal interactions that deeply involve the egos of the participants can usually be changed only through the same process by which they are maintained -- through new one-to-one actions supported by other members of the subsystem and legitimized through the formation of new intra-group norms.

Because man's rational and emotional sides are inextricably mingled, organizational change can achieve stability only if it takes adequate account of the participants' emotional natures. Research shows that men invest emotion in at least three domains: (1) achievement, also labeled curiosity, exploration, or activity; (2) affiliation, also delineated by some as the interpersonal dimension of love, indifference, and hostility; and (3) influence or power, also described as the dimension of dominance-submission. Most interpersonal relations and the motivations concomitant with them can be construed as having achievement, affiliation, and influence components. Emotional experiences can become problems when any one of these motivational states is frustrated.

Any job becomes attractive and draws upon the best abilities of its incumbent to the extent that it satisfies one or more of these three needs. Feelings in the area of achievement can be harnessed by the specialist when he helps staff members gain a clear conception of one another's goals. Affiliative feelings can be gratified by helping to build a cohesive unit in which staff members find friendliness and the reciprocal exchange of support and warmth. Feelings related to power

can be satisfied by helping a subsystem to allow for influence at all levels. All these emotional states are potentially harnessed through taking a problem-solving orientation to organizational life in schools.

Using the Theory

Our theory points us toward working with subsystems, not with individuals or with opportunistic collections of individuals. We reject the strategy of making better organizations by improving the members. Instead, we seek to alter organizational functioning by changing the interactions among members. In training, furthermore, we deal during any one unit of training with the interactions within the subsystem: a group of individuals held together by norms and roles and interdependent in carrying out their tasks.

Furthermore, we do not spend much time studying individuals and directing our interventions to individuals. Instead, we help subsystems to design ways of working that will offer opportunities to satisfy the three needs we mentioned earlier. We then leave it to the initiative and ingenuity of individuals to take advantage of the opportunities to satisfy their uppermost needs. And they do so.

The tactics or sub-strategies we use in the overall design of a large intervention do not follow in simple logic from the theoretical assertions we made earlier in this paper. One reason (among others) is that the tactics also rest on the practical experience we have had with alternate sequences. We shall skip a good deal of explanation and describe briefly some major tactics we recommend to organizational

specialists. Each tactic focuses effort upon a particular function in the organization. Improving these functions, we believe, is essential if the self-renewing capacity is to be achieved.

1. Organizational specialists should first judge the sorts of discrepancies that exist between the school's goals and its actual organizational performance. Some features to be diagnosed are: (a) the school's current level of tension in relation to achieving its goals, (b) the possible directions that the school might move in achieving its goals, (c) the goals that are or are not being achieved, (d) the problem-solving processes that the school uses to cope with discrepancies, and (e) the ways that the school now checks to see if it is achieving its goals.

2. Organizational specialists should assess the level of role clarity in the school. The important features are (a) sufficiently promulgated definition and support from the school district's administration (central office), (b) adequate level of confidence in the role-performance of others vis-a-vis oneself, and (c) sufficiently understood roles of others in distant parts of the school so that the entire organization can be perceived as an organization to which one sees that he belongs in a meaningful way.

3. Organizational specialists should pay attention to the flow of communication in the school organization. Almost inevitably, malfunctioning in a school will show itself in weakened and distorted communication at crucial links. In contrast, schools that undergo successful organizational training evince continuing formalized activities for improving communication. The specialists should diagnose a school's attempts to improve its communication by checking to see if new forms

of communication remain reasonably stable, to see if more than just a few staff members get involved in the new mode of communication, and to see if there is agreement in the school that the new form is legitimate and that it helps the staff to accomplish its goals.

4. Organizational specialists should assess the extent to which the school has a repertoire of interpersonal techniques for collaboration in small task-groups. They should assess the success of staff members in performing communication skills such as paraphrasing, describing one another's behaviors objectively without imputing motives, and expressing their own feelings openly and constructively.

5. Organizational specialists should assess to what extent a variety pool is available for producing new and appropriate ways of solving organizational problems. Neither people nor organizations take on a new way of behaving merely because someone conceives of the new mode. Formalized ways for adopting new patterns must be present; the variety pool, if it is to be effective, must represent a capability for organized action. It must be institutionalized and rewarding.

To locate the variety pool in schools, the specialists should look for recently altered interrelations of roles, the diverse ways of transmitting information present in the school, commitments of man-hours to temporary projects, the variety of choices and classroom innovations actually being tried out, and the like. Often new activities in schools take the form of committee work, curricular alterations, financial changes, alterations in schedules, procedural innovations at meetings, or finding new roles for students or new jobs for the faculty. An important evidence of an active variety pool in a school is the practice of new forms without prior approval of administrators, at least up to the point of disruption of existing routines. Further, in seeking possible new

contributions to the variety pool, the specialists should look at the deviant behavior in the school and assess its potential for being converted to constructive use.

6. Organizational specialists should assess to what extent the school contains means for selecting some innovative activities to be maintained in the variety pool and means for rejecting others. The school should have a method for deciding whether any proposed innovation points sufficiently close to a goal to justify keeping the innovation in readiness for use. Significant individuals in the school should be able to verbalize goals in ways with which others would agree. Norms in the school should support continuous comparisons between expressed goals and the implications of current action, and committees should exist for deciding what is to be done about the lack of matching between expressed goals and proposed ways of doing things. The specialists should insist on clearer statements of goals, should help convene frequent conferences of a problem-solving type to seek ways of bringing current action into harmony with goals, and should suggest "trial runs" of new organizational forms for bringing about an understandable correspondence between the variety pool and proclaimed goals.

7. Organizational specialists should assess to what extent the school has a method for institutionalizing an innovation after it has been judged suitable and worth keeping. OD training that helps a faculty to search its own members for useful resources will create a school in which the staff members invent their own methods of maintaining an accessible variety pool. A variety pool will probably be more accessible when the distribution of power in a faculty is more equalized. Conscious modes of maintaining innovations will be more likely to appear after

training that gives practice in using feedback-loops and in seeking evidence of successful innovations.

8. Finally, the organizational specialists -- as a team -- should become a permanent and legitimate body in the school district. The team must be supported both intellectually and financially by the district's decision makers. It should be established as a formally differentiated subsystem with a coordinator who reports directly to the superintendent and its own budget. The team remains integrated and in touch with other parts of the district because of its heterogeneous membership. Composition of the ideal team would include members from all parts and role levels of the district.

A Recommended Sequence for Integrating Specialists into Other Districts

A team of organizational specialists in a school district is one way of developing the self-renewing character of the district. Especially when the specialists are drawn from different roles and hierarchical levels in a district, their work together can build useful techniques whereby intra-district communications are clarified and constructive attitudes are taken to problem-solving. The success of the specialists depends on their ability to open up communication and to improve problem-solving skills in ways that allow existing resources to be used. Certain preconditions for a successful cadre of organizational specialists can be sketched as a result of our experience in Kent and Eugene.

From the beginning of the project, all significant job sectors within a district should be involved in defining objectives and delineating problems. Second, a vertically organized group of persons of high

influence should attend a short training event in which OD theory and techniques are demonstrated. The demonstration should explicitly reveal the differences between OD and sensitivity training (see Schmuck, Runkel, and Langmeyer, 1971). Third, this high-influence group should form a steering committee for the project from one of its own subgroups. The steering committee should decide on a means of advertising and of selecting the recruits for the training. A coordinator of the steering committee should be identified as the coordinator for the specialists. He will report directly to the superintendent. The recruits that are sought by the coordinator and his steering committee should represent most of the significant professional roles in the district. Fourth, the specialists should experience intensive initial training during three weeks in which they learn how to perform as group-process facilitators. Fifth, the team forms into several subgroups for the first round of training attempts. The specialists try out their skills under the guidance of outside consultants. The subgroups focus upon (1) a public-relations function to inform others in the district about OD through demonstrations, (2) an inservice course in communication skills, group exercises, and group problem-solving to educate individuals in the district about the building blocks of OD, and (3) OD interventions for schools which have already had some training and for those which have had none. Finally, the team develops its own best set of procedures for monitoring its own performance for improving the skills of its members, and for getting new members.

Helps and Hindrances in Establishing Teams of Specialists

Our experience in both Kent and Eugene indicates a number of

things the outside consultants can do to help the organizational specialists get off to a good start. A number of features of the Kent and Eugene projects speeded and heightened the effectiveness of the teams of specialists in their work. Members of both districts were able to comprehend something of the probable role of the organizational specialist through participation in some of the training that had been conducted by the CASEA consultants. (Actually, almost everyone who applied for training as a specialist in Kent had experienced the work of CASEA first-hand. In Eugene, most of the recruits had experienced CASEA-like events through demonstrations, inservice workshops, and college courses.) These facts minimized false anticipations on the part of applicants and gave the summer training events something of a head start.

Because of participation in CASEA-led or CASEA-like events, many members of the two districts also had some familiarity with the kind of work the specialists would be doing. The superintendent in Kent, for example, knew what the specialists were talking about when they proposed to help with the processes during his staff meetings. The Area Directors in Eugene knew very clearly what the work of the specialists would be like. The principals of both districts had at least a beginning understanding of what they were contracting for when they asked for help from the specialists. This familiarity lessened the likelihood of crossed signals, misapplications, and disappointments. The familiarity with the specialists' sort of work on the part of others in the district also resulted in confidence and support from others. The two superintendents supported the work by allowing two very capable curriculum specialists, one in each district, to spend time as coordinators of the specialists. They also supported the specialists by releasing ten days a year to each

for his work as a specialist.

The many jobs represented among the specialists made available to them a wide variety of resources. These resources included intimate knowledge of particular schools, liaison with the local education associations, and access to the superintendent and his cabinet (called clinic in Eugene).

In both districts, the specialists were soon recognized as available to any segment of their district. No doubt this occurred because the wide range of jobs among the specialists prevented them being looked on as an adjunct of any one school or division, and also because they sought out, for their early projects, work that would take them into various segments of the district.

In Kent, a norm was established early that maintained respect for diversity among the specialists. As early as the end of February, 1970, the steering committee of the organizational specialists had stated that a member of the district could participate in the work of the specialists in several ways: (1) as an occasional observer and reporter, (2) as an instructor of an inservice course, (3) as an active member of a team of specialists in a particular OD intervention but not as a regular member of the specialist group with duties to the specialists as a body, (4) as a regular member of the specialist group, and (5) as a regular member with additional duty as a member of the steering committee. This tolerance of various roles within the specialists has enabled them to make optimum use of the talents and time of each person who works with them. Moreover, the gradation of responsibility among the roles provides a natural channel for developing new members of the body as a whole. Although at the time of this writing it is too soon to tell, it appears that Eugene,

too, will adopt a norm of flexibility and diversity for its specialists.

Our theory of organizations leads us to believe that a key cause of the successful functioning of the specialists is their image, not merely as a list of individuals, but as a team or subsystem within the districts, with a group identity as clear as that of a school or central office division. This subsystem character was produced among the specialists by giving them tasks during training that increased their interdependence and their readiness to call upon one another for help with the expectation of receiving it. The subsystem character, in turn, made it easy for the specialists to allocate duties, establish and disband subteams, and call upon the resources of one another on short notice.

Our experiences in Kent also showed that our strategy for building the specialist team had some weaknesses and limitations. In the earlier part of the Kent project, sites for interventions were picked mostly by the specialists; the projects did not arise at the initiative of the people occupying the sites. In a few instances, the trainees felt as if the OD were being imposed upon them. One way specialists can give a school the opportunity to invite them in (and increase the likelihood of such an invitation) is to make opportunities for the faculty to discuss its own problems within itself, with the specialists serving as little more than conveners of the discussions until an opportunity arises to offer their other skills. Another way -- the way currently being adopted in Eugene -- is to offer brief (two hours to two days) demonstrations of "what OD is" and then to let the recipients choose whether they want OD training.

A second weakness of our approach in Kent was the perception on the part of many of the Kent staff that the specialists were part of the

outside CASEA consultant group rather than an integral part of the district. We believe this perception was intensified among those personnel who never actually participated in any of the OD training as a result of certain fears many of them formed about what the CASEA consultants -- and consequently the specialists -- might ask them to do. The most prominent fear was that of self-disclosure and the release of strong emotion that many people associate with "sensitivity training." This misapprehension was strengthened in Kent by the principals' attendance at the Human Relation Laboratory in June, 1968. That event consisted mostly of experience in T-groups, with personal growth rather than OD as the goal. Some Kent principals communicated the belief to teachers that the training done by the CASEA consultants and Kent specialists would be similar to their T-group experience. The CASEA consultants should have devoted more time to demonstrating the nature of the projected OD training to interested teachers in the district. In Eugene, we are being careful to do this by urging a subgroup of specialists to develop strategies for demonstrating OD throughout the district.

Perhaps the most serious limitation to both the Kent and the Eugene cadres relates to the professional expectations and workloads of the specialists. Both districts are vigorously pursuing other change-oriented programs and many of the specialists are committed to some of these other programs. For some specialists, conflicts will develop in their own minds over which of the projects should receive highest priority. In Eugene, we have attempted to seek clear commitments from the specialists with the understanding that some extra time will be required to make the project successful.

Another limitation is that the specialists will sometimes

encounter role conflicts; they will inevitably obtain diagnostic data about others that can be used for evaluative rather than facilitative purposes. Or they may wish to move back from certain confrontations if they think their own status in the district could be threatened. Currently, we are trying to mitigate limitations like these in our work with the Eugene district. A final limitation is the lack of a clearly worked out set of procedures for increasing the knowledge and skills of the specialists. In brief, the specialists will need their own mechanisms for self-renewal. Currently, we are developing a strategy for refurbishing local teams of specialists through regional linking organizations (see Runkel, 1970, for details).

To sum up briefly our current recommendations for developing a cadre of organizational specialists, the district should involve representatives of all ranks and types of jobs, demonstrate repeatedly the nature of OD in various segments of the district, and wait for subgroups in the district to ask for help. Administrators and influential teachers should be encouraged to indicate their support of the project in concrete ways; payment for training events, offer of secretarial services, and offer of space for meetings and storing supplies. Since most organizational specialists will be expending a great deal of extra time and energy in the project, the fragile relationship between the district and the project must be carefully nurtured.

If it exercises due regard for the nature of a subsystem in a human organization, a school district will find that the development of a cadre of specialists in organizational training can be a relatively inexpensive way of refurbishing ineffective group processes and of bringing about a greater capacity for self-renewal.

References
for
Integrating Organizational Specialists into School Districts

by

Richard A. Schmuck and Philip J. Runkel

Katz, D., and R. Kahn
1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley.

Langmeyer, D., R. Schmuck, and P. Runkel.
1971 "Technology for Organizational Training in Schools." Sociological Inquiry. Vol. 41(2), Spring.

McGregor, D.
1967 The Professional Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Runkel, P.
1970 "Linking Organizations to Maintain Organizational Development and Transmit Innovation." Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Schein, E., and W. Bennis.
1965 Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods. New York: John Wiley.

Schmuck, R., P. Runkel, and D. Langmeyer.
1971 "Theory to Guide Organizational Training in Schools." Sociological Inquiry. Vol. 41(2), Spring.

Schmuck, R., P. Runkel, S. Saturen, R. Martell, and B. Derr.
In Press Handbook for Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books.

Thomas, T. A.
1970 "Changes in Elementary School Principals as a Result of Laboratory Training." Technical Report No. 5, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Wyant, S.
1971 "Organizational Specialists in a School District: A Follow Up Study." Unpublished Master s Thesis, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.